



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/886,855	06/21/2001	Nikos P. Pitsianis	800.0053	8039

27997 7590 09/28/2004

PRIEST & GOLDSTEIN PLLC
5015 SOUTHPARK DRIVE
SUITE 230
DURHAM, NC 27713-7736

EXAMINER

RAMPURIA, SATISH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SR

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/886,855

Applicant(s)

PITSIANIS ET AL.

Examiner

Satish S. Rampuria

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed on 06/21/2001.
2. Claims 1-36 are pending.

Drawings

4. Drawing filed on 10/09/2001 are accepted by the examiner.

Claim objections

5. Claims 11, 15, 18, and 36 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claims 11 and 15, abbreviations "LV" and "XV" is used. It is not clear what do they stand for; full form of the abbreviation is required.

Regarding claim 18, page 19, line 10, a ";" should be placed instead of a "." at the end of step.

Claims 36, has the similar mistake to those in claim 18 with respect to a ";" should be placed instead on a "." at the end of step, recited on page 21, line 25.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101 Utility

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 1, 15,16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claims are non-statutory because they recite components of allocating memory for VLIW, representing functional descriptive material without a computer readable medium or

Art Unit: 2124

computer implemented, program/method per se are not tangibly embodied. Claims 1-18 thus amounts to only abstract idea and are nonstatutory.

The rejection of the base claim is necessarily incorporated into the dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, and 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,930,508 to Faraboschi et al. (hereinafter called Faraboschi) in view of US Patent No. 6,305,014 to Roediger et al. (hereinafter called Roediger).

Per claims 1 and 10:

Faraboschi disclose:

- A method of indirect very long instruction word (VLIW) instruction memory (VIM) allocation (col. 3, lines 1-2 “method for storing and decoding instructions for a microprocessor”) comprising the steps of:
- identifying a plurality of VLIW instructions in an input source program (col. 3, lines 2-3 “identifying each word of an instruction”);
- allocating VIM based on the lifetime of each of said plurality of VLIW instructions (col. 3, lines 13-15 “stores instructions in the same format resulting in better utilization of on-

chip cache memory”).

Faraboschi does not explicitly disclose determining a lifetime of each of said plurality of VLIW instructions.

However, Roediger discloses in an analogous computer system determining a lifetime of each of said plurality of VLIW instructions (col. 1, lines 62-65 “determining the lifetimes of fixed registers in the computer program. By determining the lifetimes of fixed registers, the instruction scheduler can achieve a schedule that has a higher degree of parallelism”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of determining the lifetime of the registers as taught by Roediger into the method of storing and decoding instructions for a microprocessor as taught by Faraboschi. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to determine lifetime for VLIW instruction to provide faster execution of computer program as suggested by Roediger (col. 1, lines 37-57).

Per claims 11, 12:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Faraboschi do not explicitly disclose shortening the life of a particular VLIW by placing an initialization LV statement adjacently prior to the use of its corresponding XV statement.

However, Roediger disclose in an analogous computer system shortening the life of a particular VLIW by placing an initialization LV statement (col. 10, lines 37-43 “The instructions is removed from the conditional dependence graph... instruction is analyzed to determine if it

has a conditional dependence on another instruction... If... instructions... conditional dependence... begin an independent lifetime of a bottleneck...) adjacently prior to the use of its corresponding XV statement (col. 10, lines 49-52 "instructions... lifetime of the bottleneck... defined... instructions... scheduled prior to any instruction in other lifetime").

The feature of shortening the life of a particular VLIW by placing an initialization LV statement adjacently prior to the use of its corresponding XV statement would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Per claims 13 and 14:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Faraboschi does not explicitly disclose utilizing a coalescing heuristic to reduce VIM requirements of a program.

However, Roediger discloses in an analogous computer system utilizing a coalescing heuristic to reduce VIM requirements of a program (col. 10, lines 59-63 "First we select the sub instruction... remove the sub instruction from the conditional dependence graph". Also, fig. 12 and related discussion).

The feature of utilizing a coalescing heuristic to reduce VIM requirements of a program would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Per claim 15:

Faraboschi discloses:

- A method of optimizing the execution time of a user program by reducing redundant loads of very long instruction word (VLIW) instruction memory (VIM) (col. 2, lines 66-

67 “The present invention includes an instruction encoding method to reduce or eliminate NOPs in VLIW instructions”) comprising the steps of:

- selecting a load VIM (LV) instruction in a current node (col. 3, lines 2-3 “identifying each word of an instruction that does not contain a NOP code”); and

Faraboschi does not explicitly disclose placing the LV instruction in a new node which is closer to a program start node.

However, Roediger discloses in an analogous computer system placing the LV instruction in a new node which is closer to a program start node (col. 10, lines 37-43 “The instructions is removed from the conditional dependence graph... instruction is analyzed to determine if it has a conditional dependence on another instruction... If... instructions... conditional dependence... begin an independent lifetime of a bottleneck...”). The limitation regarding the execution frequency in the body of the claim does not give any patentable weight because the preamble of the claim does not recite any limitation related to execution frequency.

The feature of shortening the life of a particular VLIW by placing an initialization LV statement adjacently prior to the use of its corresponding XV statement would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 19, 28-31, 32, 33 are the apparatus claim corresponding to method claims 1, 10-14, 11, 15 respectively, and rejected under the same rationale set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1, 10-14, 11, 15 respectively, above.

10. Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 20-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faraboschi, Roediger in view of US Patent No. 6,675,380 McKinsey et al. (hereinafter called McKinsey).

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Faraboschi disclose:

- determining VLIW interference (col. 3, lines 6-7 “generating a delimiter code for each identified word”).

Neither Faraboschi nor Roediger explicitly disclose determining a control flow graph for the input source program containing said plurality of VLIW instructions; determining a VLIW flow graph for said plurality of VLIW instructions; and determining VLIW interference.

However, McKinsey discloses in an analogous computer system determining a control flow graph for the input source program containing said plurality of VLIW instructions (col. 5, lines 29-30 “The control flow graph... is made up of blocks of instructions”. Also, fig. 7 and related discussion); determining a VLIW flow graph for said plurality of VLIW instructions (col. 5, lines 31-32 “Each block... contains one or more instructions that will execute in an order defined by the control follow graph”. Also, fig. 7 and related discussion).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of using control flow graph to determine instructions (VLIW) as taught by McKinsey into the method of storing and decoding instructions for a microprocessor as taught in combination system by Faraboschi and Roediger. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to

Art Unit: 2124

use control flow graph to improve the instruction execution performance of a processor as taught by McKinsey (col. 1, lines 55-67).

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and further, Neither Faraboschi nor Roediger explicitly disclose solving VLIW flow equations.

However, McKinsey discloses in an analogous computer system solving VLIW flow equations (figs. 10, 11, 13A and 13B).

The feature of solving VLIW flow equations would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

Per claims 4, 5:

The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and further, Neither Faraboschi nor Roediger explicitly disclose a plurality of nodes which correspond to basic blocks of the VLIW instructions; and a plurality of edges, wherein each edge corresponds to a jump or a call from a given basic block to another basic block.

However, McKinsey discloses in an analogous computer system a plurality of nodes which correspond to basic blocks of the VLIW instructions (col. 4, lines 63-64 “blocks... referred to as nodes in the control flow graph”); and a plurality of edges, wherein each edge corresponds to a jump or a call from a given basic block to another basic block (col. 5, lines 39-41 “The directed edge determine the relationship between predecessor blocks and successor blocks in the control flow graph”).

The feature of plurality of nodes which correspond to basic blocks and edges corresponds to a jump or a call from a given basic block to another basic block would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

Per claims 6 and 7:

The rejection of claim 5 is incorporated, and further, Neither Faraboschi nor Roediger explicitly disclose determining live-in sets and live-out sets for each of said plurality of nodes and wherein the VLIW flow graph comprises the control flow graph and the live-in sets and live-out sets for each of said plurality of nodes.

However, McKinsey discloses in an analogous computer system determining live-in sets and live-out sets for each of said plurality of nodes (col. 4, lines 63-64 "blocks... referred to as nodes in the control flow graph" and col. 10, lines 6-9 "The method begins... determines... computers a "live on exit" value") and wherein the VLIW flow graph comprises the control flow graph and the live-in sets and live-out sets for each of said plurality of nodes (col. 4, lines 63-64 "blocks... referred to as nodes in the control flow graph").

The feature of determining live-in sets and live-out sets and VLIW flow graph comprises the control flow graph and the live-in sets and live-out sets would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5.

Per claim 8:

The rejection of claim 7 is incorporated, and further, Neither Faraboschi nor Roediger explicitly disclose determining an interference graph in which every node of the interference graph corresponds to one of said plurality of VLIW instructions.

However, McKinsey discloses in an analogous computer system determining an interference graph in which every node of the interference graph corresponds to one of said plurality of VLIW instructions (col. 6, lines 42-44 "The dependence graph... includes nodes... each representing a single instructions").

The feature of determining an interference graph for VLIW instructions would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 7.

Per claim 9:

The rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and further, Neither Faraboschi nor Roediger explicitly disclose inserting an undirected edge into the interference graph between two VLIW nodes if the two VLIW instructions belong to a live-out set of the same node of the VLIW flow graph; and coloring the interference graph nodes such that adjacent interference nodes are colored in different colors and each color corresponds to a different VIM line.

However, McKinsey discloses in an analogous computer inserting an undirected edge into the interference graph between two VLIW nodes if the two VLIW instructions belong to a live-out set of the same node of the VLIW flow graph (col. 5, lines 39-41 "The directed edges determine the relationship between predecessor blocks and successor blocks in the control flow graph"); and coloring the interference graph nodes such that adjacent interference nodes are

Art Unit: 2124

colored in different colors and each color corresponds to a different VIM line. It would be obvious for one skilled in the art to color the graph nodes to distinguish from one another.

The feature of determining an interference graph for VLIW instructions would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 8.

Claims 20-27 are the apparatus claim corresponding to method claims 2-9 respectively, and rejected under the same rationale set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 2-9 respectively, above.

11. Claims 18 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,675,380 McKinsey et al. (hereinafter called McKinsey).

Per claim 18:

McKinsey disclose:

- determining an interference graph comprising VLIW nodes in which every VLIW node of the interference graph corresponds to one VLIW instruction (col. 6, lines 42-44 “The dependence graph... includes nodes... each representing a single instructions”).
- inserting an undirected edge into the interference graph between two VLIW nodes if the two VLIW instructions belong to a live-out set of the same node of the VLIW flow graph (col. 5, lines 39-41 “The directed edges determine the relationship between predecessor blocks and successor blocks in the control flow graph”); and

- coloring the VLIW graph nodes such that adjacent VLIW nodes are colored in different colors and each color corresponds to a different VIM line. It would be obvious for one skilled in the art to color the graph nodes to distinguish from one another.

Claim 36 is the apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 18 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 18 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. Claims 16-17 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,675,380 McKinsey et al. (hereinafter called McKinsey).

Per claims 16-17:

McKinsey disclose:

- A method to statically determine liveness of indirect very long instruction word (VLIW) instructions (col. 10, lines 7-9 “determines whether I is a store or a branch instructions, or if I computes a “live on exit” value”) comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2124

- determining a control flow graph which includes nodes representing basic program blocks (col. 4, lines 63-64 “blocks... referred to as nodes in the control flow graph”), and edges connecting the nodes which represent jumps and calls from one block to another block (col. 5, lines 39-41 “The directed edge determine the relationship between predecessor blocks and successor blocks in the control flow graph”); and
- determining a VLIW flow graph by solving VLIW flow equations (figs. 10, 11, 13A and 13B).

Claims 34-35 are the apparatus claim corresponding to method claims 16-17 respectively, and rejected under the same rationale set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 16-17 respectively, above.

Substantially as claimed.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Satish S. Rampuria** whose telephone number is **703-305-8891**.

The examiner can normally be reached on **8:30 am to 5:00 pm**.

Art Unit: 2124

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Kakali Chaki** can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satish S. Rampuria
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2124
09/20/2004



ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER